



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/253,110	02/19/1999	MATTHEW ROY JORGENSEN	JRE 301	5234
23581	7590	01/16/2004		
KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C. 520 S.W. YAMHILL STREET SUITE 200 PORTLAND, OR 97204			EXAMINER CHOI, STEPHEN	
			ART UNIT 3724	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/253,110

Applicant(s)

JORGENSEN, MATTHEW ROY

Examiner

Stephen Choi

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02 October 2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 24-25 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al. (US 4,875,398) in view of Terpstra et al. (US 4,576,072).

Taylor discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a rigid overhead conduit assembly (40), a vacuum source (48), and a hood assembly pivotally connected to the conduit assembly (42). It is noted that the hood assembly is pivotally connected to the conduit assembly via elements 58, 60, and 62. Taylor fails to disclose an air intake opening in front of a lead cutting edge. However, Terpstra discloses an air intake opening in front of a lead cutting edge (col. 5, lines 55-66) to form a passageway for drawing airflow and sawdust from a cutting area. It would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 3724

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Taylor to provide the air intake opening as taught by Terpstra in order to facilitate removing of sawdust when the hood assembly is raised from the worktable. Regarding claim 25, a debris collection chamber is a necessary element of Taylor's device.

Regarding claim 28, the modified device of Taylor discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for a substantially transparent material. Taylor discloses only a major portion of a front wall being made of transparent material. However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide the hood made of a transparent material since the examiner takes official notice of the use of transparent material as old and well known in the art for the purpose of providing visual access to the interior of hood.

Regarding claim 29, Taylor discloses a forwardly inclined nose panel (69).

4. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor et al. (US 4,875,398) in view of Terpstra et al. (US 4,576,072) as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Vogl et al. (US 3,249,134).

The modified device of Taylor discloses the invention substantially as claimed including two side panels (68, 70). The modified device of Taylor fails to disclose a side skirt that pivots and slides relative to the side panels by a pivot pin and slot mechanism. Vogl discloses shields (32, 35) connected to guards (31, 34) by pivot screws (33, 36) and slots (40). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ side skirts that pivots and slides relative to the side panels as taught by Vogl on the modified device of Taylor in order to improve the

Art Unit: 3724


safety of the device by preventing the rotating blade from being exposed to a user and outward flying of sawdust.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. DE 3615736.
6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Choi whose telephone number is 703-306-4523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday between 9am and 5pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

SC
January 9, 2004


STEPHEN CHOI
PRIMARY EXAMINER